



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Smith et al.

Serial No.: 10/828,579

Filed: April 20, 2004

Customer No.: 33123

For: *APPARATUS AND METHOD
FOR HIGH RESOLUTION
IN-SITU ILLUMINATION
SOURCE MEASUREMENT IN
PROJECTION IMAGING
SYSTEMS*

Art Unit: 2851

Examiner: Nelson, Vivian Hsu

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence and the attached papers are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail on the date indicated below in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

9/6/05
Date

Michelle M. M. M.
Signature

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed August 5, 2005 containing a restriction requirement, Applicants hereby elect Group I (Claims 1-35), drawn to an apparatus. The Examiner required election between Group I (Claims 1-35) and Group II (Claims 36-47). Applicants reserve the right to file continuing applications directed to the non-elected claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement, based on the Examiner's indication that the apparatus of the Group I claims "can be practiced by a photocopying machine" and that the process of the Group II claims "describes the procedure for operating the typical photocopier of Group I". The Examiner concluded that the two groups of claims were "related as process and apparatus for its practice" and requested election.

Applicants submit that a photocopier in no way includes "a plurality of discrete imaging objectives" as recited in the independent claims, comprising Claims 1, 19, 23, 29, 32, 34, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46 (the discrete objectives were also referred to in the claims as a "multiple imaging objective" or "multiple field objective"). Applicants assert that the claims cannot be described as practiced by a photocopying machine and a process for operating a photocopying machine, applicants submit that the claims are not "related as process and apparatus for its practice," as was characterized by the examiner in the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the restriction requirement and withdrawal of the requirement for election. Prosecution of all the pending claims (Claims 1-47) is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
HELLER EHRMAN LLP

By: 

David A. Hall

Registration No. 32,233

Address all correspondence to:

David A. Hall

HELLER EHRMAN LLP

4350 La Jolla Village Drive, 7th Floor

San Diego, CA 92122-1246

Telephone: (858) 450-8400 Facsimile: (858) 450-8499

Email: david.hall@hellerehrman.com

SD 759057 v1(38203.6294)